APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/705,927	11/06/2000	David D. Kloba	1933.0010009	8134

82515   7590   08/25/2010
Sterne, Kessler, Goldstein & Fox P.L.L.C.
1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

EXAMINER
FABER, DAVID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/25/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/705,927	KLOBA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DAVID FABER	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 July 2010</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-4,7,9-13,16,18-22,25,27-30 and 34-41</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>38-40</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-4, 7, 9-13, 16, 18-22, 25, and 27-30, 34-37, 41</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/29/10</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 26 July 2010 and the

Information Disclosure Statement filed on 29 July 2010.

        This office action is made Final.

2.   Claims 9, 18, 19, 20, 22, 25, 27, 34, and 41 have been amended.

3.   The rejection of Claims 9, 18, 27 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, has

been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

4.   Claims 1-4, 7, 9-13, 16, 18-22, 25, and 27-30, 34-41 are pending. Claims 38-40

have been withdrawn. Claims 1, 10, 19, and 28-30 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

5.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 29 July 2010 is in

compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure

statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
> making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
> art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
> set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7.   Claim 41 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to

comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter

which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to

one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed,

had possession of the claimed invention.

8.   Claim 41 recites the limitation "storing at least said document in a first memory,

wherein said first memory is read-only memory, and wherein said document cannot be

modified from said first memory". However, the Examiner is unable to locate any

disclosure in a clear, written description within the specification stating the limitation

when reviewing the specification. Furthermore, since this feature is not described in the

specification for the instant application, the examiner is forced to make a broad

interpretation for this feature.

9.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10.   Claim 19-22, 25, 27, 34 and 41 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second

paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the

subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

11.   Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, since it appears to

be a hybrid claim. The preamble claims an program product (system/apparatus), but the

body of the claim refers to the method steps ("determining", "parsing", etc). This

renders the claim indefinite, since it is unclear what the claimed subject matter is.

12.   Claim 34 recites the limitation "using the vtable pointer to access the instance

method associated with the object" It is unclear to the Examiner how the vtable pointer

accesses the instance method when in line 2 of Claim 34 discloses a vtable pointer that

points to an entry in a vtable, and lines 3-4 of Claim 34 discloses a function pointer

within an entry in the table that points to an instance method. Thus, based on the claim

limitations of Claim 34, a vtable pointer does not point to an instance method, thus it

cannot access an instance method; only a function pointer that points to an instance

method can access the method. Thus, Claim 34 is viewed as vague and indefinite.

13.   Claim 41 recites the limitation "storing at least said document in a first memory,

wherein said first memory is read-only memory, and wherein said document cannot be

modified from said first memory". It is unclear to the Examiner how data can be stored,

therefore written, to a memory if the memory is read-only (i.e. non writeable). If a

memory is or set to be read-only, then data cannot be written or stored to that memory.

Thus, its unclear to the Examiner how a is stored, therefore written, to a memory if the

memory is read-only. Therefore, Claim 41 is vague and indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

15.   Claims 1-3, 7, 10-12, 16, 19-21, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Whitledge et al (US Patent #6,925,595, filed 10/5/1998) in

further view of Burkett et al (US Patent #6,671,853, filed 7/15/1999)

        As per independent Claim 1, Whitledge et al discloses a method comprising:

- Determining display and memory parameters of a device based on device information (e.g., Column 8, lines 5-15: Discloses obtaining device-conversion preferences that are to be used to convert an original electronic document into converted electronic document that would allow it to be displayed on a smaller display with a lower resolution, which includes a PDA (Column 21, lines 1-2) The device-conversion preferences would inherently describe the specifications of the display screen of the device which in other words, disclose the resolution, memory, screen size and video information.)

- Parsing requesting content into a document having a plurality of objects; laying out said document according to said display and memory parameters of said device. (Column 8, lines 19-27: Discloses converting content, wherein content includes objects such as text, images, video, audio, based on preferences into a document. One embodiment includes parsing content into a document that includes converting the content based on the conversion preferences. (Column 23, lines 9-40; FIG 8B)

- Generating a document table for said document, wherein said document table includes object pointers corresponding to respective objects of the plurality of objects, wherein each object pointer includes an attribute pointer that points to a respective object in said content stream;. (Column 24, lines 35-40: Discloses in a embodiment where selected, wherein selected can be all, hypertext elements references (points to the elements) are saved into a symbol table so they can used in other expression or documents. These

references are viewed as pointers to the elements (objects), wherein an

reference is a form of attribute pointer since it points to a respective object.)

- transmitting said content stream to said device and said device receives said

    content stream. (Column 8, lines 29-34, 40-47)

Whitledge et al discloses converting a original electronic document that contains

content into a converted electronic document based on conversion preferences.

However, Whitledge et al fails to specifically disclose the original electronic document

contains a plurality of pages. On the other hand, it was well-known to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention that a document may contain more

than one page within it. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

have modified Whitledge et al's document to contain more than one pages since it

would have provided the benefit of keeping single page document related to each other

in one location and reducing the number of total documents which would prevent

documents relating to each other being lost or misplaced.

Furthermore, Whitledge et al fails to specifically disclose inputting said document

and a document table into a content stream. However, Burkett et al discloses parsing a

document into DOM trees and having the tree be streamed into a binary format in which

the streamed objects are known as serialized objects. In addition, any embedded or

referenced objects are processed recursively during the process. (Column 3, lines 1-26;

line 64 – Column 4, line 2) Thus, pointers remain intact and are presented in the stream.

Furthermore, Burkett et al states the streaming process includes identifying portions or

fragments of a document wherein the fragments are written (inputted) into a serialized

binary format, thus containing all the fragments or objects are in the content stream.

(Abstract, lines 5-10) Therefore, a plurality of objects are presented in the content

stream when the fragments are parsed and streamed as serialized binary data.

Furthermore, when the document is serialized where its parsed into a DOM tree then

serialized, it begins with the root node of the tree, and recursively descends through the

lower-level tree nodes. Thus, the tree is serialized (inputed) into a stream in a defined

order by levels as it starts with top node, and serialize each node as it descends into

lower levels. When finished, the stream is written onto a communications channel.

(Column 3, lines 1-26; line 64 – Column 4, line 2) Whitledge et al discloses an

embodiment in by parsing a document first into a DOM tree, and creating a table

comprising object references before converting the document. (FIG 9-12, Column 24,

lines 9- Column 25, lines 67) Thus in conjunction with Whitledge, a document table

containing object references (pointers to elements) are processed, thus remaining intact

during Burkett's serialization into a serial data (content stream) Thus, the pointers are

presented in the stream.

      It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the Applicant's

invention to have combined Whitledge et al with Burkett's method since Burkett et al's

method would have provided the benefit of wherein documents encoded can be more

efficiently processed.

      In addition, Whitledge fails to especially disclose using an attribute pointer that

points to an object of said document included in said content stream to selectively

access and copy said object from said content stream to a writable memory of said

device, thereby enabling modification of said object without copying said entire document to said writable memory of said device, and wherein said attribute pointer is part of an object pointer from said document table in said content stream. On the other hand, Whitledge discloses the functionality for a device to receive a document from another device wherein one or more elements can be extracted from the document through the use a DOM of the received document. Once extracted, an element is converted by using data mining operations. By extracting one of the elements, it "copying" the element from the document into a separate temporary memory, i.e. a memory buffer, (a form of writable memory) to be converted (i.e. modified). (Col 24, lines 18-21; Column 25, lines 50-64; Column 31, lines 1-5; Col 33, lines 4-10) Furthermore, Whitledge discloses the functionality of references to the selected elements (pointers to the element) are saved into a symbol table so they can used in other expressions or documents. These references are viewed as pointers to the elements (objects), wherein a reference is a form of attribute pointer since it points to a respective object.) Thus, since the pointers are saved in the table and can be used in other expressions for the document or other documents, Whitledge discloses the ability for existing pointers from the table that were saved to be used in extracting objects from a document into a memory. (Column 24, lines 35-40)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention that allow a user on a device to convert extracted elements from a document using existing pointers from a table since it would have provided the benefit of presenting the elements into a desired format suitable for display on the device.

As per dependent Claim 2, Claims 2 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1 and is similar rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Whitledge et al discloses a method wherein said object-by-object basis corresponds to distinguishable pieces of request content. (Column 21, line 11 - Column 23, lines 40; FIG 8B: Discloses different objects, text and images, are identified as text and images making them distinguishable.)

As per dependent Claim 3, Whitledge et al discloses a method wherein said document table provides points of reference to the objects of said document content (Column 24, lines 35-40: Discloses in a embodiment where selected, wherein selected can be all, hypertext elements references (points to the elements) are saved into a symbol table so they can used in other expression or documents.

As per dependent Claim 7, Whitledge et al discloses said storing said content stream to a mobile device. (Column 8, lines 29-34; 40-47: Discloses receiving a converted document wherein when the document is received, its inherently saved to temporary memory buffer for further operation.)

As per independent claim 10, Claim 10 recites a system for performing the method of Claim 1 and is similar rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 11, Claim 11 recites similar limitations as in Claim 2, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 12, Claim 12 recites similar limitations as in Claim 3, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 16, Claim 16 recites similar limitations as in Claim 7, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per independent claim 19, Claim 19 recites a computer program product... for performing the method of Claim 1 and is similar rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 20, Claim 20 recites similar limitations as in Claim 2, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 21, Claim 21 recites similar limitations as in Claim 3, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 25, Claim 25 recites similar limitations as in Claim 7, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

16.   Claims 4, 13, and 22 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitledge et al (US Patent #6,925,595, filed 10/5/1998) in further view of Burkett et al (US Patent #6,671,853, filed 7/15/1999) in further in view of Barron (US Patent #6,665,709, filed 3/27/2000).

As per dependent Claim 4, Whitledge et al discloses compressing said document content (Column 23, lines 9-54: Discloses image size being reduced or compressed of its original size to be able to meet the conversion preferences.)

However, Whitledge et al, Lindsay et al, and Burkett fail to specifically disclose encrypting said document content. However, Barron discloses a method of encrypting electronic data into an encrypted data packet. (Column 6, Claim 1, line 48-49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Whitledge et al, Lindsay et al, and Burkett 's methods with Barron's method since Barron's method would have facilitated virtually impregnable security for the delivery, storage and sharing of documents and files.

As per dependent claim 13, Claim 13 recites similar limitations as in Claim 4, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 22, Claim 22 recites similar limitations as in Claim 4, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

17.   Claims 9, 18, 27, 34-36, 41 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitledge et al (US Patent #6,925,595, filed 10/5/1998) in further view of Burkett et al (US Patent #6,671,853, filed 7/15/1999) in further view of Lindsay et al (US Patent 6,754,670, filed 12/17/1999) in further view of Gerald et al (US Patent 6,092,079; patented 7/18/2000; filed on 4/7/1998)

As per dependent claim 9, Claim 9 recites similar limitation as in Claim 1 and is similar rejected under rationale. In addition, Whitledge discloses modifying an object (Column 23, lines 9-54: Discloses content, such as image, being altered or modify to accustom to the PDA device conversion preferences during the process being received by the PDA.) Furthermore, Whitledge and Burkett fail to specifically disclose wherein

said object pointer further comprises a vtable pointer for accessing instance methods

associated with said object. However, Lindsay et al discloses a relational table mapping

within object oriented system wherein the table is mapped (pointing) to an attribute

object and associated get/set methods associated the attribute object. (Col 3, line 67-

Col 4, line 10) Thus, Lindsay et al discloses a pointer pointing to an object (attribute

object), a form of an attribute pointer, and another pointer pointing to access a instance

method associated with the object (get/set methods), a form of a vtable pointer.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the Applicant's

invention to have combined Whitledge et al and Burkett's method with Lindsay et al's

methods since Lindsay et al's method would have provided the benefit of wherein the

object oriented system retains flexibility to accommodate changes and increases

efficiency.

Furthermore, Whitledge et al, Burkett et al and Lindsay et al fail to specifically

disclose copying said object to a writable memory space, altering said copied object

with respective instance methods accessed using said vtable pointer and updating an

attribute pointer of said object pointer to the writable memory space of said object that

has been altered. However, Gerard et al discloses updating an object by making a copy

of the object in memory (thus new memory space for modification) wherein the object is

updated (altered) by different called methods through the use of a table pointer, and the

data pointer (points to the object data (Col 5, lines 20-21) is updated to point to from

data section of the original object to the data section of the copied object. (Col 7, line 45

– Col 8, line 10; Col 8, line 63-66; Col 9, lines 45-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to have combined Whitledge et al, Lindsay et al, and Burkett 's

methods with Gerald et al's method since Gerald et al would have provided the benefit

of an efficient and less costly method of updating persistent objects in an object oriented

computer system.

As per dependent claim 18, Claim 18 recites similar limitations as in Claim 9 and

is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 27, Claim 27 recites similar limitations as in Claim 9 and

is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependents claims 34-36, Claims 34-36 recite similar limitations as in

Claim 9 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 41, Claim 41 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1 and

9 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

18.   Claims 28-29 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Whitledge et al (US Patent #6,925,595, filed 10/5/1998) in further in view of Barron

(US Patent #6,665,709, filed 3/27/2000) in further view of Burkett et al (US Patent

#6,671,853, filed 7/15/1999) in further view of Lindsay et al (US Patent 6,754,670, filed

12/17/1999) in further view of Gerald et al (US Patent 6,092,079; patented 7/18/2000;

filed on 4/7/1998).

As per independent Claim 28, Claim 28 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1 and 9 are similarly rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Whitledge et al discloses a method comprising:

- Parsing requesting content into a document having a plurality of discrete objects, each discrete object having a format based on at least said display and memory parameters. (Column 8, lines 19-27: Discloses converting content, wherein content includes objects such as text, images, video, audio, based on preferences into a document. One embodiment includes parsing content into a document that includes converting the content based on the conversion preferences. (Column 23, lines 9-40; FIG 8B)

- Generating a document table based on said object-by-object basis for said document content. (Column 24, lines 35-40: Discloses in a embodiment where selected, wherein selected can be all, hypertext elements references (points to the elements) are saved into a symbol table so they can used in other expression or documents.

- compressing said document content according to said object-by-object basis (Column 23, lines 9-54: Discloses image size being reduced or compressed of its original size to be able to meet the conversion preferences.)

- modifying an object of the plurality of objects, wherein said object corresponds to distinguishable pieces of said requested content. (Column 23, lines 9-54: Discloses content, such as image, being altered or modify to

accustom to the PDA device conversion preferences during the process being

received by the PDA.)

However, Whitledge et al fails to specifically disclose encrypting said document

content according to said object-by-object basis. However, Barron discloses a method

of encrypting electronic data into an encrypted data packet. (Column 6, Claim 1, line 48-

49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to have combined Whitledge et al with Barron's method since

Barron's method would have facilitated virtually impregnable security for the delivery,

storage and sharing of documents and files.

Whitledge et al and Barron fail to specifically disclose inputting said document

content into a content stream according to said object-by-object basis wherein said

content stream includes the plurality of objects, and inputting said document table into

said content stream according to said object-by-object basis, wherein said document

and said document table form said content stream according to said mobile device

information. However, Burkett et al discloses parsing a document into DOM trees and

having the tree be streamed into a binary format in which the streamed objects are

known as serialized objects. In addition, any embedded or referenced objects are

processed recursively during the process. (Column 3, lines 1-26; line 64 – Column 4,

line 2) Furthermore, Burkett et al states the streaming process includes identifying

portions or fragments of a document wherein the fragments are written (inputted) into a

serialized binary format, thus containing all the fragments or objects are in the content

stream. (Abstract, lines 5-10) Therefore, a plurality of objects are presented in the

content stream when the fragments are parsed and streamed as serialized binary data.

Furthermore, when the document is serialized where its parsed into a DOM tree then

serialized, it begins with the root node of the tree, and recursively descends through the

lower-level tree nodes. Thus, the tree is serialized (inputted) into a stream in a defined

order by levels as it starts with top node, and serialize each node as it descends into

lower levels. When finished, the stream is written onto a communications channel.

(Column 3, lines 1-26; line 64 – Column 4, line 2) Whitledge et al discloses an

embodiment in by parsing a document first into a DOM tree, and creating a table

comprising object references before converting the document. (FIG 9-12, Column 24,

lines 9- Column 25, lines 67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the Applicant's

invention to have combined Whitledge et al with Barron's methods since Burkett et al's

method would have provided the benefit of wherein documents encoded can be more

efficiently processed.

As per independent claim 29, Claim 29 recites similar limitations as in Claim 28

and is similarly rejected under rationale.

19.   Claims 37 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Whitledge et al (US Patent #6,925,595, filed 10/5/1998) in further view of Burkett et al

(US Patent #6,671,853, filed 7/15/1999) in further view of Lindsay et al (US Patent

6,754,670, filed 12/17/1999) in further view of Gerald et al (US Patent 6,092,079;

patented 7/18/2000; filed on 4/7/1998) in further view of Fallon (US Patent 6,309,424;

filed on 11/3/2000; continuation of App 09/210491, filed 12/11/1998)

As per dependent claim 37, Whitledge, Burkett, Lindsay, and Gerald failed to

specifically disclose decompressing the object. However, Fallon discloses a well-known

method of decompressing data (i.e. object) within a compressed data stream. (FIG 1)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the Applicant's

invention to have combined Whitledge et al, Burkett, Lindsay, and Gerald with Fallon's

disclosure of decompressing data since it would have provided the benefit of reversing

the compressed data for the user to access the data as it was originally created.

Response to Arguments

20.   Applicant's arguments filed 26 July 2010 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

21.   On page 14, in regards to the rejection of Claim 41 under 35 USC 112, second

paragraph, Applicant states pages 36-38 and FIG 2F3 of the application provide support

for the features of claim 41. However, the Examiner disagrees.

According to pages 36-38 and FIG 2F3, neither the pages or the figure disclose a

document being stored into a memory wherein the memory is read-only (non-writeable)

Pages 36-38 and FIG 2F3 discloses data being placed into writable memory. (Note:

Examiner assumes Applicant is referring data as being a document; however, the

specification doesn't explicitly state data is a document; therefore data can be any form

of data) A writeable memory is different from a read-only memory. Therefore, the

Examiner is unable to locate any disclosure in a clear, written description within the

specification stating the limitation when reviewing the specification.

22.   On pages 14-19, in regards to Claim 1 and its parallel claims, Applicant argues

that the combination of applied references fail to specifically teach a receiving device

uses pointers included in a received document table to access and copy poritions of a

receivied document since Whitledge only describes extracting elements from a

document using data mining expressions at the transmitting device. However, the

Examiner disagrees.

        Based on Applicant's argument, it appears that the Applicant is arguing that the

applied references do not teach the limitations: *"wherein said device receives said*

content stream and uses an attribute pointer that points to an object of said document

included in said content stream to selectively access and copy said object from said

content stream to a writable memory of said device, thereby enabling modification of

said object without copying said entire document to said writable memory of said

device, and wherein said attribute pointer is part of an object pointer from said

document table in said content stream."

        According to the claim language of the claim limitation, it states the device

receives said content stream wherein the document and table are apart of the stream

(disclosed in previous limitation). Since the stream was received by the device, the data

is now fully stored on the device. Therefore, the document and document table is fully

stored on the device. Therefore, based on the claim language of the limitation,

Whitledge fails to especially disclose uses an attribute pointer that points to an object of

said document included in said content stream to selectively access and copy said

object from said content stream to a writable memory of said device, thereby enabling

modification of said object without copying said entire document to said writable

memory of said device, and wherein said attribute pointer is part of an object pointer

from said document table in said content stream. On the other hand, Whitledge

discloses the functionality for a device to receive a document from another device

wherein one or more elements can be extracted from the document through the use a

DOM of the received document. Once extracted, an element is converted by using data

mining operations. By extracting one of the elements, it "copying" the element from the

document into a separate temporary memory, i.e. a memory buffer, (a form of writable

memory) to be converted (i.e. modified). (Col 24, lines 18-21; Column 25, lines 50-64;

Column 31, lines 1-5; Col 33, lines 4-10) Furthermore, Whitledge discloses the

functionality of references to the selected elements (pointers to the element) are saved

into a symbol table so they can used in other expressions or documents. These

references are viewed as pointers to the elements (objects), wherein an reference is a

form of attribute pointer since it points to a respective object.) Thus, since the pointers

are saved in the table and can be used in other expressions for the document or other

documents, Whitledge discloses the ability for existing pointers from the table that were

saved to be used in extracting objects from a document into a memory. (Column 24,

lines 35-40)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Applicant's invention that allow a user on a device to convert extracted elements from a

document using existing pointers from a table since it would have provided the benefit

of presenting the elements into a desired format suitable for display on the device.

Conclusion

23.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to David Faber whose telephone number is 571-272-2751.

The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday, and every other Friday.

       If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

       Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/David Faber/
Examiner, Art Unit 2178